



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/865,773	05/25/2001	Aruna Rohra Suda	103251.58983US	5757

23911 7590 03/17/2008
CROWELL & MORING LLP
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP
P.O. BOX 14300
WASHINGTON, DC 20044-4300

EXAMINER

PULLIAM, CHRISTYANN R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2165

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

03/17/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims pending in the application are 1, 50, 52-57, 59-61, 63-64, 66-67, 69, 72-73, 75-77, 93, 97, 99 and 101-148.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Claims 1, 50, 52-57, 59-61, 63-64, 66-67, 69, 72-73, 75-77, 93, 97, 99 and 101-148 are pending as amended December 21, 2007. Claims 1, 59, 63-64, 66-67, 69, 72-73, 75, 77, 93, 97, 99, 101 and 103 are currently amended. Claims 50, 52-57, 60-61 and 102 are previously presented. Claim 76 is original. Claims 104-148 are new. Claims 2-49, 51, 58, 62, 65, 68, 70-71, 78-92, 94-96, 98 and 100 are canceled.

2. Rejections remain, so this action is FINAL.

Double Patenting

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29

USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 59-60 and 148, and dependent Claims 61, 63-64, 66-67, 69, 72-73, 75-77, 97, 101-102, 104-138, are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1-46 of copending Application No. 09/938,866. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they claim all the same elements with the same functionality.

The independent claims in present application, Claims 59-60 and 148, require acquiring web page data;.... assigning a predetermined index to web page data and...saving means for saving the web page data. Similarly, copending Application No.

09/938,866, independent Claims 1 and 24 contain a means for acquiring initiating saving; means for indexing predetermined index to datameans for data saving acquired datapredetermined storage unit. Claim 4 of App 09/938,866 contains the keyword extraction presented in the present application. Further, many dependent claims use the exact same wording in both applications. See chart below for a comparison of the independent claim requirements.

Current App 09/865,773	Copending Application No. 09/938,866
<p>Claims 59, 60, 148</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- acquiring web page data browsed by a browser client- extracting a keyword from a content of the acquired web page data- assigning a plurality of indices that include a first index unique to the acquired web page data and- a second index comprising the extracted keyword to the acquired web page data- saving the acquired web page data in correspondence with the	<p>Claims 1 and 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- means for acquiring one of either the content or the URL of the currently displayed page from the browser (Claim1)- said means for acquiring obtains one of either a keyword or a title embedded in a page displayed in said browser (Claim 4)- means for indexing, said means for indexing assigning a predetermined index to data acquired by said means for acquiring (Claim 1)- said means for indexing assigning a predetermined index to the keyword or the title (Claim 4)- means for data saving acquired data with the assigned index in a

assigned indices in a predetermined database	predetermined storage unit (Claim 1)
--	--------------------------------------

Both applications also claim priority to the same three Japanese applications.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claim 125 recites the limitation "the specific data". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

7. Claim 126 recites the limitation " the predetermined rule" and "the data train". There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

8. Claims 126 and 142 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The phrasing in Claim 126 is unclear "extracting a domain name from the rest of the data with referring to a knowledge base of domain names" (Emphasis added). Similarly, in Claim 142, the phrasing is unclear

Art Unit: 2169

“selecting an automatic save mode, and in the automatic save mode; and determining a condition” (Emphasis added). The semicolon might be causing the confusion.

9. Claim 146 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 146 is duplicative of Claim 101.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

10. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

11. Claims 1, 50, and 52-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Amendments added “including a processor” to preamble of 1. This is not sufficient to overcome the 101 rejection. The system as described in the body of the claim is still software. The hardware (processor) is not functionally interconnected to the software functionality described in the body. When functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium, it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized. Compare *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d 1031, 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1994). Merely claiming nonfunctional descriptive material, i.e., abstract ideas, stored on a computer-readable medium, in a computer, or on an electromagnetic carrier

signal, does not make it statutory. See *Diehr*, 450 U.S. at 185-86, 209 USPQ at 8 (noting that the claims for an algorithm in *Benson* were unpatentable as abstract ideas because “[t]he sole practical application of the algorithm was in connection with the programming of a general purpose computer.”). Accordingly, Claims 1, 50 and 52-57 are non-statutory.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. **Claims 1, 59-61, 63, 64, 66-67, 69, 93, 97, 99, 101-107, 111-132, and 147-148 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barrera et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,567,800 (hereinafter Barrera) and in view of Cole et al., U.S. Patent no. 5,933,827 (hereinafter Cole).**

As for Claims 1, Barrera teaches:

data acquisition means for acquiring web page data browsed by a browser client (See e.g. Barrera – col. 4, line 26-30, Vspider to return information related to web page particularly textual content, page size, data and other related web page information that corresponds to acquiring web page data);

keyword extraction means for extracting a keyword from a content of the acquired web page data (See e.g. Barrera –col. 4, line 26-30, line 56-62, keywords, extracting textual content, from the web page or website particularly content is correlated with a category);

indexing means for assigning a plurality of indices that include a first index unique to the acquired web page data and a second index comprising the extracted keyword to the acquired web page data (See e.g. Barrera –col. 5, line 1-4, line 17-19, categories are listed for example search by subject corresponds to indexing information related to keywords from the web page, and dynamic index is stored that including list of web pages or URLs; first index unique to the acquired web page data and a second index corresponds to Barrera's categories and sub-categories because each category is uniquely identifies information and fig 1, element 101);

saving means for saving the acquired web page data in correspondence with the assigned indices (See e.g. Barrera Figure 5) in a predetermined database, the saved web page data being sufficient to regenerate at least a portion o a previously browed web page without accessing to the original source (See e.g. Barrera – col. 5, line 25-26, one 38-42, metatags in the web pages provide specific category or categories related to website identifiers sufficient to display content from the file or site) and

setting means for setting to save all the browsed data without any instruction by the user for each of the browsed data, wherein said saving means save the browser client data when the browsing is operated to moved to another URL (See e.g. Barrera col. 4, line 4-6).

Barrera does not specifically teach, “newly browses the web page data”, although Barrera does teach web page data acquiring as detailed in col. 4, line 26-30. However, Cole teaches newly browses the web page data (See e.g. Cole – col. 6, line 36-40, line 46-48, line 61-67, col. 7, line 1-2, fig 3, fig 8, newly browses the web page data corresponds to categories containing new entries as detailed in fig 3,8).

Barrera and Cole are from the analogous art of searching and arranging web pages (See Barrera: Abstract, fig 6; Cole: Abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made having the teachings of Barrera and Cole to have combined Barrera and Cole. The motivation to combine Barrera and Cole to add new web pages of Cole to the system of Barrera is to allow users of Barrera to incorporate profile building function that specifically includes hot links of related category of each of the new web page data, further indicates the source of the request and it is also noted that client always makes a request for “what is new” that allows uses to fetch all the new data entries for those categories from the database as suggested by Cole (See e.g. Cole – col. 6, line 23-40 and fig 3) bringing the advantages of users can order a list of recently added web pages of interest (See e.g. Cole –col. 2, line 50-55). Both Barrera and Cole specifically teach categories and sub-categories (See e.g. Barrera: figure 1 and col. 1, line 46-48; Cole: col. 3, line 54-57) and both specifically teach search engines particularly Yahoo (See e.g. Barrera: figure 1; Cole: col. 3, line 55-56).

As for Claims 59-60 and 93 and 148, Barrera teaches:

acquiring web page data browsed by a browser client (See e.g. Barrera – col. 4, line 26-30, Vspider to return information related to web page particularly textual content, page size, data and other related web page information that corresponds to acquiring web page data)...;

extracting a keyword from a content of the acquired web page data (See e.g. Barrera –col. 4, line 26-30, line 56-62, keywords, extracting textual content, from the web page or website particularly content is correlated with a category);

assigning a plurality of indices that include a first index unique to the acquired web page data and a second index comprising the extracted keyword to the acquired web page data (See e.g. Barrera –col. 5, line 1-4, line 17-19, categories are listed for example search by subject corresponds to indexing information related to keywords from the web page, and dynamic index is stored that including list of web pages or URLs; first index unique to the acquired web page data and a second index corresponds to Barrera's categories and sub-categories because each category is uniquely identifies information and fig 1, element 101);

saving the acquired web page data in correspondence with the assigned indices (See e.g. Barrera Figure 5) in a predetermined database, the saved web page data being sufficient to regenerate at least a portion o a previously browsed web page without accessing to the original source (See e.g. Barrera – col. 5, line 25-26, one 38-42, metatags in the web pages provide specific category or categories related to website identifiers sufficient to display content from the file or site).

Barrera does not specifically teach, “newly browses the web page data”, although Barrera does teach web page data acquiring as detailed in col. 4, line 26-30. However, Cole teaches newly browses the web page data (See e.g. Cole – col. 6, line 36-40, line 46-48, line 61-67, col. 7, line 1-2, fig 3, fig 8, newly browses the web page data corresponds to categories containing new entries as detailed in fig 3,8).

The motivation to combine Barrera and Cole is explained with Claim 1.

As for Claim 99, Barrera teaches:

acquiring web page data browsed by a browser client (See e.g. Barrera – col. 4, line 26-30, Vspider to return information related to web page particularly textual content, page size, data and other related web page information that corresponds to acquiring web page data);

extracting a keyword from a content of the acquired web page data (See e.g. Barrera –col. 4, line 26-30, line 56-62, keywords, extracting textual content, from the web page or website particularly content is correlated with a category);

assigning a plurality of indices that include a first index unique to the acquired web page data and a second index comprising the extracted keyword to the acquired web page data (See e.g. Barrera –col. 5, line 1-4, line 17-19, categories are listed for example search by subject corresponds to indexing information related to keywords from the web page, and dynamic index is stored that including list of web pages or URLs; first index unique to the acquired web page data and a second index

corresponds to Barrera's categories and sub-categories because each category is uniquely identifies information and fig 1, element 101);

saving the acquired web page data in correspondence with the assigned indices (See e.g. Barrera Figure 5) in a predetermined database, the saved web page data being sufficient to regenerate at least a portion o a previously browsed web page without accessing to the original source (See e.g. Barrera – col. 5, line 25-26, one 38-42, metatags in the web pages provide specific category or categories related to website identifiers sufficient to display content from the file or site); and

receiving a save instruction from a user, wherein said indexing means assigns the index to the web page data and said saving means saves the web page data if the save instruction is received (See e.g. Barrera – col. 3, lines 55-65 and col. 5, line 17-19 – Vspider only runs and saves if a user tells it to and also users select categories and that information is saved after user instruction).

Barrera does not specifically teach, “newly browses the web page data”, although Barrera does teach web page data acquiring as detailed in col. 4, line 26-30. However, Cole teaches newly browses the web page data (See e.g. Cole – col. 6, line 36-40, line 46-48, line 61-67, col. 7, line 1-2, fig 3, fig 8, newly browses the web page data corresponds to categories containing new entries as detailed in fig 3,8).

The motivation to combine Barrera and Cole is explained with Claim 1.

As for Claims 147, Barrera teaches:

acquiring web page data browsed by a browser client (See e.g. Barrera – col. 4, line 26-30, Vspider to return information related to web page particularly textual content, page size, data and other related web page information that corresponds to acquiring web page data)...;

extracting a keyword from a content of the acquired web page data (See e.g. Barrera –col. 4, line 26-30, line 56-62, keywords, extracting textual content, from the web page or website particularly content is correlated with a category);

assigning a plurality of indices that include a first index unique to the acquired web page data and a second index comprising the extracted keyword to the acquired web page data (See e.g. Barrera –col. 5, line 1-4, line 17-19, categories are listed for example search by subject corresponds to indexing information related to keywords from the web page, and dynamic index is stored that including list of web pages or URLs; first index unique to the acquired web page data and a second index corresponds to Barrera's categories and sub-categories because each category is uniquely identifies information and fig 1, element 101);

saving the acquired web page data in correspondence with the assigned indices (See e.g. Barrera Figure 5) in a predetermined database, the saved web page data being sufficient to regenerate at least a portion o a previously browsed web page without accessing to the original source (See e.g. Barrera – col. 5, line 25-26, one 38-42, metatags in the web pages provide specific category or categories related to website identifiers sufficient to display content from the file or site)

creating nodes corresponding to groups classified on the basis of the timing of savings (See e.g. Barrera -col. 4, line 56-59);

creating a hierarchy of nodes by dividing a group corresponding to a period into a plurality of sub group each corresponding to a shorter period (See e.g. Barrera -col. 4, line 56-59);

creating a node corresponding to each of subgroup (See e.g. Barrera -col. 5, line 1-4); and

displaying a plurality of nodes the created nodes in an order of saving (See e.g. Barrera -col. 5, line 4-6).

Barrera does not specifically teach, “newly browses the web page data”, although Barrera does teach web page data acquiring as detailed in col. 4, line 26-30. However, Cole teaches newly browses the web page data (See e.g. Cole – col. 6, line 36-40, line 46-48, line 61-67, col. 7, line 1-2, fig 3, fig 8, newly browses the web page data corresponds to categories containing new entries as detailed in fig 3,8).

The motivation to combine Barrera and Cole is explained with Claim 1.

As for Claim 61, Barrera as modified by Cole teaches parent Claim 60. Barrera also teaches index is dynamically generated (See e.g. Barrera -col. 5, line 17-19).

As for Claim 63, Barrera as modified by Cole teaches parent Claim 60. Barrera also teaches retrieving data from said database based on a user-supplied index (See e.g. Barrera -col. 4, line 59-62, col. 5, line 25-29).

As for Claims 64 and 104, Barrera as modified by Cole teaches parent Claims 59 and 60. Barrera also teaches:

sorting means for sorting indices of the data in the database (See e.g. Barrera col. 2, line 66-67, col. 3, line 1 and categorizing most relevant information as detailed in col. 3, line 1);

display means for displaying a result of the sorting by said sorting means (See e.g. Barrera - figure 8 and col. 5, line 4-5).

As for Claims 66 and 105, Barrera as modified by Cole teaches parent Claims 59, 60, 64 and 104. Barrera also teaches:

selecting means for selecting an index from the indices displayed on said display means (See e.g. Barrera figures 8-9);

retrieval means for retrieving data corresponding to the index selected by said selecting means from the database (See e.g. Barrera -col. 5, line 5-8 retrieving content or data within the specific category).

As for Claims 67 and 106, Barrera as modified by Cole teaches parent Claims 59, 60, 64 and 104. Barrera also teaches:

deleting means for deleting at least one index from the indices displayed on said display means (See e.g. Barrera col. 5, line 25-26);

Art Unit: 2169

removal means for removing data corresponding to the index deleted by said deleting means from the database (See e.g. Barrera – col. 5, line 25-26, “dynamic index” which is a real-time indexing that including of websites in the category and subcategories).

As for Claim 69, Barrera as modified by Cole teaches parent Claim 60. Barrera also teaches sending the acquired data to a predetermined destination (See e.g. Barrera -col. 4, line 10-12, line 62-65).

As for Claim 97 and 144, Barrera as modified by Cole teaches parent Claims 60 and 59. Barrera also teaches:

receiving an index (See e.g. Barrera -col. 4, line 58-59);

searching the storage unit for web page stored in correspondence with the same index as the received index (See e.g. Barrera -col. 4, line 62-65).

As for Claim 101-103 and 146, Barrera as modified by Cole teaches parent Claims 59, 60 and 93. Barrera also teaches generating the first index (See e.g. Barrera - fig 1, col. 1, line 49-56) which is other than data extracted from the acquired web page (See e.g. Barrera -col. 4, line 57-62).

As for Claim 107, Barrera as modified by Cole teaches parent Claims 59 and 104. Barrera also teaches wherein at least one of the data has a plurality of values for

an index, and said sorting means places the plurality of values at positions corresponding to respective values (See e.g. Barrera col. 2, line 27-30, fig 4).

As for Claim 111, Barrera as modified by Cole teaches parent Claim 59. Barrera also teaches wherein the assignment of a plurality of indices includes acquiring a URL of the data from the browser as the second index (See e.g. Barrera col. 5, line 17-19).

As for Claim 112, Barrera as modified by Cole teaches parent Claim 59. Barrera also teaches wherein the assignment of a plurality of indices includes acquiring a title embedded in the data from the browser as the second index (See e.g. Barrera col. 5, line 19-25).

As for Claim 113, Barrera as modified by Cole teaches parent Claim 59. Barrera also teaches wherein the index includes a time when the data is saved, said storage medium further comprising code causing the computer to perform:

creating nodes corresponding to groups classified on the basis of the timing of saving (See e.g. Barrera -col. 4, line 56-59)

creating a hierarchy of nodes (See e.g. Barrera -col. 4, line 56-59) by dividing a group corresponding to a period into a plurality of sub group each corresponding to a shorter period and creating a node corresponding to each of sub group (See e.g. Barrera -col. 5, line 1-4); and

displaying a plurality created nodes in an order of saving (See e.g. Barrera -col. 5, line 4-6).

As for Claim 114, Barrera as modified by Cole teaches parent Claims 59 and 113. Barrera also teaches each group corresponds to a network session (See e.g. Barrera -col. 1, line 10-14).

As for Claim 115, Barrera as modified by Cole teaches parent Claim 59. Barrera also teaches assigning a word specified by a user as a further index to the data to be saved by said saving means (See e.g. Barrera col. 2, line 26-29).

As for Claims 116, Barrera as modified by Cole teaches parent Claim 59. Barrera also teaches wherein when an index assigned to the data to be saved has been assigned to other data, the data is saved as a new data or updates the other data according to a setting by the user (See e.g. Barrera col. 5, line 17-19).

As for Claims 117, Barrera as modified by Cole teaches parent Claim 59. Barrera also teaches wherein when an index assigned to the data to be saved has been assigned to other data, the user is inquired as to whether the data is to be saved as a new data or update data (See e.g. Barrera col. 5, line 17-19).

As for Claim 118, Barrera as modified by Cole teaches parent Claim 59. Barrera also teaches:

comparing the effective period with a current time at a predetermined timing (See e.g. Barrera col. 4, line 25-28);

removing data in correspondence with the effective period before the current time based upon the result of a comparison by said comparing means (See e.g. Barrera col. 5, line 11-16).

As for Claim 119, Barrera as modified by Cole teaches parent Claim 59. Barrera also teaches wherein the browsed data is saved in a first save mode and a URL for the browsed data is saved in place of the browsed data in a second save mode (See e.g. Barrera col. 3, line 58-62).

As for Claim 120, Barrera as modified by Cole teaches parent Claim 59. Barrera also teaches further comprising setting to save all the browsed data is to be saved without any instruction by the user for each of the browsed data (See e.g. Barrera col. 4, line 13-15).

As for Claim 121, Barrera as modified by Cole teaches parent Claim 59. Barrera also teaches further comprising said setting means for setting to save all the browsed data without any instruction by the user for each of the browsed data (See e.g. Barrera col. 4, line 4-6).

As for Claim 122, Barrera as modified by Cole teaches parent Claims 59 and 121. Barrera also teaches wherein the browser client data is saved when the browsing is operated to move to another URL (See e.g. Barrera - col. 4, line 21-22).

As for Claim 123, Barrera as modified by Cole teaches parent Claim 59. Barrera also teaches setting not to save the browsed data in a URL specified by the user (See e.g. Barrera -col. 4, line 17-20).

As for Claim 124, Barrera as modified by Cole teaches parent Claim 59. Barrera also teaches extracting as an index a specific data from a data train constituting address of the browsed data in the network on the basis of a predetermined rule (See e.g. Barrera -col. 4, line 59-62), specific data corresponds to selected category.

As for Claim 125, Barrera as modified by Cole teaches parent Claim 59. Barrera also teaches the specific data is a domain name (See e.g. Barrera -col. 1, line 39-40, col. 2, line 25-26, col. 4, line 21-22), domain names are used in URLs to identify particular Web pages like in the URL as detailed in col. 1, line 39-40).

As for Claim 126, Barrera as modified by Cole teaches parent Claims 59 and 125. Barrera also teaches wherein the predetermined rule is a rule for eliminating a parameter, a protocol, an obvious address, and page data from the data train, and

Art Unit: 2169

extracting a domain name from the rest of the data with referring to a knowledge base of domain names (See e.g. Barrera -col. 1, line 39-48).

As for Claim 127, Barrera as modified by Cole teaches parent Claims 59 and 124. Barrera also teaches wherein the specific data is a name of organization (See e.g. Barrera -col. 2, line 25-26).

As for Claim 128, Barrera as modified by Cole teaches parent Claims 59, 124 and 127. Barrera also teaches wherein the predetermined rule is a rule for eliminating a parameter, a protocol, an obvious address, and page data from the data train, and determining the rest of the data as an organization name (See e.g. Barrera -col. 1, line 39-48 and col. 2, line 25-32).

As for Claim 129, Barrera as modified by Cole teaches parent Claims 59, 124 and 127. Barrera also teaches wherein the predetermined rule includes a rule for dividing the rest of the data into partial data with a predetermined symbol and determining each of the partial data as an organization name (See e.g. Barrera -col. 2, line 25-32).

As for Claim 130, Barrera as modified by Cole teaches parent Claim 59. Barrera also teaches sending the acquired web page data or a specific part thereof to a destination (See e.g. Barrera -fig 5, col. 3, line 52-54).

As for Claim 131, Barrera as modified by Cole teaches parent Claims 59 and 130. Barrera also teaches specific part is a URL of the saved data (See e.g. Barrera - col. 4, line 22-23).

As for Claim 132, Barrera as modified by Cole teaches parent Claims 59 and 130. Barrera also teaches the specific part is the saved data except for an embedded image (See e.g. Barrera -col. 1, line 16-17).

As for Claim 143, Barrera as modified by Cole teaches parent Claims 59 and 112. Barrera also teaches wherein the assignment of the plurality of indices includes displaying the extracted keyword or the title acquired from the browser (See e.g. Barrera -fig 9, col. 5, line 6-11).

As for Claim 145, Barrera as modified by Cole teaches parent Claim 59. Barrera also teaches further comprising receiving save instruction from a user, wherein the assignments of the plurality of indices includes assigning the indices to the web page data and the saving includes saving the web page data when the save instruction is received (See e.g. Barrera -col. 5, line 17-19).

14. Claims 50, 52-57 and 75-77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barrera as modified above by Cole, and further in view of Sidana, U.S. Patent No. 6,081,829 (hereinafter Sidana).

As for Claim 50, Barrera as modified above by Cole teaches parent Claim 1. Barrera does not expressly teach all means equipped in a server apparatus. However, Sidana teaches wherein said data acquisition means, said indexing means, said saving means, and said database are equipped in a server apparatus, (See e.g. Sidana –fig 2, col. 5, line 8-15) and said system further comprising at least one client apparatus connected to said server apparatus, each of said client apparatus transmits a user request to said server apparatus and receives a response to the user request from said server apparatus (See e.g. Sidana –col. 5, line 15-19, fig 2).

Barrera and Sidana are from the analogous art of searching and displaying web pages. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made having the teachings of Barrera and Sidana to have combined Barrera and Sidana. (See e.g. Barrera: col. 4, line 56-62; Cole: Abstract, fig 4a-b, Sidana: col. 1, lines 58-62 and Figure 7). The motivation to combine Barrera and Sidana is to allow for editing and modification of documents. Sidana allows users to search information stored on a network, particularly searching websites that use category information of Barrera, and identifying new web pages of interest to a user of Cole. Sidana allows users of Barrera and Cole to modify the document and return the modified document for viewing by the user. More specifically, the user can edit/modify

the web documents to write comments or annotations to the original viewable document (See e.g. Sidana Abstract, fig 7, col. 2, line 22-33). Sidana further allows users of Barrera, Cole to store redirected web document information because redirects allowing the user to view both his own annotations and departmental annotations from the original web document (See e.g. Sidana –col. 3, line 10-18), thus bringing the advantages of enable a user browsing the web to store information associated with a web document, without the necessity of modifying HTTP protocols, the browser software and/or the server software.

As for Claims 52 and 53, Barrera as modified by Cole and Sidana teaches parent Claims 1 and 50. Sidana also teaches:

- a local database (See e.g. Sidana –col. 4, line 20-21);
- a web information storage device for storing web information acquired from an internet (See e.g. Sidana –col. 4, line 17-19); and
- administration means for administering data in either of said database, said local database, and said web information storage device (See e.g. Sidana –col. 4, line 31-36).

As for Claims 54-57, Barrera as modified above by Cole teaches parent Claim 1. Barrera does not expressly teach all means equipped in a server apparatus. However, Sidana teaches database is equipped in a server apparatus (See e.g. Sidana –fig 1-2), and said data acquisition means, said indexing means, and said saving means are

Art Unit: 2169

equipped in at least one client apparatus connected to said server apparatus (See e.g. Sidana –col. 10, line 4-12).

As for Claim 75 and 133, Barrera as modified above by Cole teaches parent Claims 60 and 59. Barrera also teaches website content is retrieved through a network for example as detailed in fig 1-3. Barrera does not specifically teach editing the browsed data. However, Sidana teaches editing the browsed data (See e.g. Sidana –col. 6, line 36-44, fig 5).

As for Claims 76 and 134, Barrera as modified by Cole and Sidana teaches parent Claims 60, 75, 59 and 133. Sidana also teaches editing includes annotation means for adding an annotation to the browsed data (See e.g. Sidana –col. 2, line 16-21, fig 7).

As for Claim 77 and 137, Barrera as modified above by Cole teaches parent Claim 60 and 59. Barrera does not expressly teach extracting a predetermined type of data from the browsed data. However, Sidana teaches:

extracting a predetermined type of data from the browsed data (See e.g. Sidana –col. 5, line 40-45);

saving the extracted data in the database (See e.g. Sidana –col. 5, line 32-35).

As for Claim 135, Barrera as modified by Cole and Sidana teaches parent Claims 59 and 133-134. Sidana also teaches wherein said annotation is added in such a manner that the annotation is distinguishable from the browsed data (See e.g. Sidana – col. 4, line 57-67, fig 7-8).

As for Claim 136, Barrera as modified by Cole and Sidana teaches parent Claims 59 and 133. Sidana also teaches wherein said editing includes changing a display form of a designated portion in the browsed data (See e.g. Sidana –col. 5, line 58-67, fig 4).

As for Claim 138, Barrera as modified by Cole and Sidana teaches parent Claims 59 and 137. Sidana also teaches said data is extracted in a predetermined column in response to a copying operation of data from a specified portion of the browsed data to the predetermined column (See e.g. Sidana –col. 7, line 1-6, fig 6a), and said extracted data saving means saves the extracted data with an attribute corresponding to the predetermined column (See e.g. Sidana –col. 7, line 7-9, fig 6a-b).

As for Claim 139, Barrera as modified by Cole and Sidana teaches parent Claims 59 and 137. Sidana also teaches predetermined type of data includes at least one of an organization name, a person name, an Email address, a telephone number, a Fax number and a keyword appended to the data (See e.g. Sidana –col. 9, line 37-41, line 41-45, col. 10, line 39-40).

As for Claims 140, Barrera as modified above by Cole teaches parent Claim 59. Barrera does not expressly teach wherein the data requested to be saved includes data from other URL identified in the web page data, the included data from the other URL is downloaded. However, Sidana teaches wherein the data requested to be saved includes data from other URL identified in the web page data, the included data from the other URL is downloaded (See e.g. Sidana –col. 7, line 65-67, col. 8, line 1-4).

As for Claim 141, Barrera as modified by Cole and Sidana teaches parent Claims 59 and 140. Sidana also teaches wherein the data from the other URL is already available in the storage unit, the downloading of the data is not performed (See e.g. Sidana –col. 8, line 5-8).

As for Claims 142, Barrera as modified above by Cole teaches parent Claim 59. Barrera does not expressly teach mode selection and condition determination. However, Sidana teaches selecting an automatic save mode, and in the automatic save mode; and determining a condition to be satisfied to save the browsed data every time a new web page is browsed (See e.g. Sidana –fig 4, col. 5, line 58-62).

15. Claims 72-73 and 108-110 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barrera as modified above by Cole above, and further in view of Walls et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,848,410 (hereinafter Walls).

As for Claims 72-73 and 108-110, Barrera as modified by Cole above teaches the parent Claims 59 and 60. Although Barrera, Cole specifically teaches user uses key word search and selects respective web pages and building records of categories of the data from web pages (See e.g. Barrera: col. 4, line 57-65; Cole: col. 4, line 18-23, fig 4(a-b)). Barrera does not specifically teach folder creation means for creating a new folder. However, Walls teaches:

folder creation means for creating a new folder (See e.g. Walls - col. 8, line 50-55);

file name assigning means for assigning a predetermined name to the newly browsed data without intervention by a user (See e.g. Walls - col. 9, line 3-9)

file saving means for saving the newly browsed data in the new folder with the assigned file name (See e.g. Walls - fig 2-3, col. 12, line 13-22).

Barrera and Walls are from the analogous art of searching and displaying web pages. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made having the teachings of Barrera and Walls to have combined Barrera and Walls. (See e.g. Barrera: col. 4, line 56-62; Cole: Abstract, fig 4a-b, Walls: figures 9-12). The motivation to combine Barrera and Walls is allow users to save browsed data into specific folders and files in alphabetical order. This improves index-organizing elements that characterize subjects of the information and corresponding files and folders by eliminating the need periodically to repeat a search to ensure that changes in information of the one or more files are considered by the user as suggested by Walls (See e.g. Walls - col. 3, line 60-63).

Response to Arguments

16. Applicant's arguments filed December 21, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

17. Further explanation is provided above regarding the double patenting rejection, including a side-by-side comparison of the requirements.

18. Applicant argues the prior art rejection based on the amendments to Claim 1 and the “acquiring” step of the independent claims. Citations are provided above for the new requirements of amended Claim 1. Further, since the amendments adds a setting to make the saving automatic without user instruction, this moves the claims closer to the spider described in the prior art of Barrera. Regarding the “acquiring” of all the independent claims, this step was discussed in the interview but no changes were made to clarify the intended meaning or to distinguish it over the cited prior art. The cited art in combination teaches acquiring web page data. Barrera uses web page data that while collected in a different manner than the claimed invention results in the same data being collected and stored. Spiders work much like a user with a browser except must faster to cover more sites. The data gathered is still the same as required by the claimed invention. Cole adds the browser and recently viewed data elements that are missing from Barrera. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would

Art Unit: 2169

be motivated to combine Barrera and Cole to modify Barrera to focus only on the data viewed by the user. Both contain overlapping elements as described above with the motivation statement with Claim 1. Cole is cited for the "newly browsed by a browser client" so the arguments regarding Barrera and this element are moot. Additionally, Barrera teaches the user categorizing the pages so the amount of data actually necessary for the system could be quite small and allow for easy combination with Cole. Therefore, their combination after substituting Cole for the automatic collection of data, teaches the claimed invention. Regarding Claim 99 and the save instruction, additional citations and description are provided above in response to the arguments. Accordingly, Claims 1, 50, 52-57, 59-61, 63-64, 66-67, 69, 72-73, 75-77, 93, 97, 99, and 101-148 are rejected.

Conclusion

19. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2169

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christyann Pulliam whose telephone number is (571)270-1007. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9 am-6 pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christian Chace can be reached on 571-272-4190. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/C. P./

Examiner, Art Unit 2165

March 11, 2008

/N. A./

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2165

Application/Control Number: 09/865,773

Page 32

Art Unit: 2169

/Christian P. Chace/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2169